

From : Alain Painchaud, ing., da, client # 46343.
Application # 10/711 662
Bridge Converting movement into Electrical Energy.

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

NOV 10 2005

Date: 10 Nov 2005

To: Raymond Addie, Patent Examiner, USPTO, Commissioner for Patents, PO Box
1450, Alexandria, Virginia, 22313-1450, fax 571-273-8300

Reference: Some additional explanations for the appeal process

Remark

I want to add additional information in order to convince you that my patent request is by far different than all the others listed below, that you referenced in your previous letter:

1. Runner, 6 204 568 B1 :
2. Galich # 6,376,925 B1
3. Le Van # 3,944,855
4. Gott et al. # 6,858,952 B2
5. Woodbridge et al. # 5,696,413 B2

It is my firm belief that you did not understand my previous explanations and this is why you sent my Request for Patent in appeal process.

First, all of the other applicants that you have listed above have filed their inventions with mechanism PERPENDICULAR to the vehicles direction. This is a fact that we can easily see on their drawings and the way their mechanism is made renders it impossible to change it parallel to the traffic direction. Let me add you that it takes at least 20 meters (60 foot) to decelerate from 30 mph to 0 mph. This is why these inventions with mechanism perpendicular to traffic direction do not work in real life. You may check with your car what is the braking distance and you will see that I am right.

Also, even if their mechanism was able to stop a vehicle in a distance of 1 foot, it would probably be equivalent to a car accident for the driver and passengers due to the high deceleration (many g of deceleration). Now, if they do not want to stop the vehicles but just remove a bit of energy, then you have to check how much kinetic energy would be removed from the vehicles at 30 mph on 1 foot. For one vehicle of 2000 kg, there is a total 192 kJoules of Kinetic Energy contained in the vehicles at 30 mph, that's all. Assuming that there is no slope, this is all you can take from the vehicle. On one foot, they would probably be able to get 10-20 joules with their inventions, and it would create very high vibrations for the vehicles, because this will be seen as a BUMP. Not adding that 10-20 joules is worth nothing in terms of \$. This is why you never saw their inventions anywhere and you will see mine in a very short period of time.

If you look at the drawings that I filed initially, you will see that my mechanism (the moving road segments) is a sine wave generator that generates the equivalent of an endless hill. When you put a lot of these devices in series, it will simulate a hill. More or less, the steps always run away from the vehicle and this is why it creates the endless hill effect. If you look at the drawing dimensions, you will also see that a tire can be on two (or more) different moving road segments. So, when you will look at the drawings that I filed with my application, you will immediately see the very big differences between my invention and what others have claimed and filed.

For me, there are no other outcome than a patent for what I filed, because it is inventive, very different than anything else and it will bring a lot of value for Americans and everybody else. I have to acknowledge that these guys thought of removing energy from the vehicles BUT the inventions that they filed simply do not work. With all the respect that the others inventors deserve, my invention works and is very very different from their inventions, that I am sure do not work without creating BUMP effect or vibrations if you wish.

I can go to USA to meet you personally, in the event that there is a need to give more technical explanations to you or your technical staff.

Best Regards,


Alain Painchaud, ing. da.

724, Sainte Marie

Quebec (Quebec) G1R3G8

Phone; 418-529-7316 or Cel: 418-953-7027

Fax : 418-529-3119